

Appl. No.: 09/748,995
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated December 3, 2003

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims:

Claims 5-8 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4 have been cancelled.
Claims 5-8 have been amended to clarify features of the claimed invention.

II. Claim Rejections

In the Office Action dated December 3, 2003, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,119,051 to Anderson, Jr., et al ("Anderson"). Claims 1-4 have been cancelled and amended claims 5-8 are now pending.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Anderson does not disclose the recited step of "transmitting the printstream to a workstation computer . . ." and interpolating the data at the workstation to generate reprint data and a tracking database. To overcome these missing features, the Examiner has relied on Official Notice that "the transmitting of data from one computer to another in order to perform different functions at a remote computer or workstation is well known in the art . . . in order to reduce the computing load on any one workstation."

Applicant traverses the Examiner's Official Notice as applied to the rejected claims. Even if the Official Notice is a correct statement, it is insufficient to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the rejected claims.

(1a) As background for this traversal, it should be noted that the legacy computer systems for use with the invention have less flexibility than the computers that are assumed in the Official Notice. As stated in the specification of this application, and in the amended preamble of claim 5, the invention is directed to a method that does

Appl. No.: 09/748,995
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated December 3, 2003

not require alteration of the mailer's legacy computer system. The legacy computer systems are typically old mainframes that are difficult or costly to add new functionality to. See page 2, line 11, to page 3, line 2, and page 6, lines 8-16 of the present application.

As seen in Fig. 1A of the present application, a legacy system may be configured to output the print stream, and an Mail Run Data File (MRDF) for a particular type of inserter system. This prior art arrangement works adequately when the particular type of inserter system is used, but a problem arises if the mailer wants to use other types of inserter systems not originally contemplated. The other types of inserters cannot use the MRDF generated by the legacy system, and might not be able to achieve full functionality when preparing mail for the legacy systems.

In particular, the problem of multiple types of Inserters may appear if the mailer chooses to use the services of a third party mail production facility that has multiple types of inserters. In order to fully utilize such a third party mail production facility, the present invention provides flexibility without requiring special data from the legacy system.

18
Thus, the present invention is more than a mere substitution of work at one computer for another. Rather, by specifying the type of data to be transferred ("print stream data"), where it is to be transferred ("the workstation computer") and by specifying what to do with the print stream data (the "interpolating" steps), the present invention provides non-obvious flexibility and functionality to assist mailers with legacy computers that have this problem. The Official Notice relied upon by the Examiner does not provide the disclosure of what data is to be transferred, where it is to be transferred, or how it is to be processed in order to achieve the desired functionality without altering the legacy computer systems.


Appln. No.: 09/748,995
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated December 3, 2003

The preamble of independent claim 5 has been amended to reflect the nature of the legacy computer systems for use with the invention. Also, the claims have been amended to more clearly identify that the plurality of inserters are incompatible, and that the interpolation steps are directed to overcoming this incompatibility. Thus, in accordance with the above remarks and those in the prior amendment, Applicant submits that the claims are sufficiently distinguished from the Anderson reference, and that the obviousness rejection may be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the issues identified by the Examiner have been addressed and that the claims of this application are now in a condition for allowance. Favorable action on this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000